

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14 are currently amended.

Claims 15, 16 and 17 are new, and are not disclosed or suggest by the cited prior art, expressly or inherently. Support for the new claims can be found at least in paragraph 0019 of the original specification.

Objection to Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification section alleging that “computer-readable medium” in claims 9-14 lacks antecedent basis. Applicant thanks the Examiner for suggesting amendments to overcome the objection (see page 3 of the Office Action). Accordingly, Applicant amends claims 9-14, and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection

Rejection of claim 9-14 under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter

Applicant amends claim 9 to more clearly recite statutory subject matter and submits that claim 9 overcomes the rejection under 35 USC § 101. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested, at least for this reason.

Further, the Examiner alleges that “computer-readable medium” in claims 9-14 lacks antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully traverses this allegation because “computer-readable medium” was disclosed in the originally filed specification, at least in claim 9, where the original claims are a part of the original disclosure.

Furthermore, an alleged failure to provide antecedent basis for claim terminology is an improper basis for a rejection under 35 USC § 101. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection, at least for this reason.

Rejection of Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theimer (6519241 B1), in view of Hauduc et al. (6993568 B1), and further in view of Henry et al. (2003/0195952 A1)

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Theimer, Hauduc and Henry, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the features of claims 1-14, expressly or inherently.

Claim 1 recites a device for managing information data in a mobile IP-based mobile telephone, the device comprising an embedded web server, for displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on a web browser when linked to the mobile telephone through the web browser of a telecommunication system, driving a CGI/ASP program to generate a command for communication between the mobile phone and the telecommunication system using the web browser, displaying data of a selected menu stored in the mobile phone on the web browser according to the command and updating a data updated in the web browser on the mobile telephone according to the command, a CGI/ASP program of server driven by the embedded web server to generate a command for communication between the mobile telephone and the telecommunication system using the web browser, and to transmit a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser, a homepage of the mobile telephone, for displaying information management menus of the mobile telephone and including a language pack storing at least one language so that the information management menus can be displayed in a selected language, and a memory, for storing data of the information management menus.

The Examiner alleges that Theimer discloses displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone (citing to authorized browser 5, and column 3, lines 26-48). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's interpretation. Theimer discloses a web browser 5 that interrogates the location of a patient for data and proves its access authorization by a password or a digital signature (see col 3, lines 60-63). Theimer fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's device that comprises displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on a web browser when linked to the mobile telephone through the web browser of a telecommunication system, as recited in claim 1 among other features.

Further, Theimer discloses performing communication between web servers and web browsers/other servers through CGI (see col. 1, lines 16-26 of Theimer). Theimer merely discloses connecting to the WEB server via a CGI (see column 4, lines 21-22). Applicant submits that Theimer fails to disclose an embedded web server driving a CGI/ASP program to generate a command for communication between the mobile phone and a telecommunication system using the web browser, displaying data of a selected menu stored in the mobile phone on the web browser according to the command and updating a data updated in the web browser on the mobile telephone according to the command, as recited in claim 1 among other features.

The Examiner admits that Theimer and Hauduc fail to disclose updating a data updated in the web browser on the mobile telephone according to the command, and transmitting a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser. The Examiner relies on Henry to make up for Theimer's and Hauduc's deficiencies.

Applicant agrees that Theimer and Hauduc fails to disclose or suggest at least these features and further submits that Henry fails to make up for Theimer's and Hauduc's deficiencies. Henry merely discloses a digital transmitter device configuration using a web browser to manually make changes to the configuration of a digital transmitter device using an embedded-web server in the digital transmitter device (see paragraph [0004]). For example, Henry discloses a browser application executing on a host computer that can be used to control the configuration information for the digital transmitter device (see paragraph 13). Applicant submits that Henry relates to editing and updating information on a digital transmitter device using a web browser. Henry alone or in any combination, fails to disclose or suggest updating a data updated in the web browser on the mobile telephone according to the command, and transmitting a message confirming that data updated in the web browser has been updated in the mobile telephone to the web browser, as recited in claim 1 among other features.

Thus, claim 1 is allowable at least for these reasons.

Claim 2 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable base claim 1.

Claim 3 recites a method for managing information data in a mobile IP-based mobile telephone, the method comprising the steps of accessing the mobile telephone through an Internet web browser of a telecommunication system, displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on the web browser, selecting a language at the homepage displayed on the web browser, displaying information management menus in the selected language, when one menu is selected from the information management menus, driving, by an embedded web server of the mobile phone, a CGI/ASP program of the mobile phone to generate a command, and displaying data of the selected menu stored in the mobile phone on the web browser according to the command, when the data of said menu is updated in the web browser, driving, by the embedded web server of the mobile phone, the CGI/ASP program of the mobile phone to generate a command, and updating the same data updated in the mobile telephone according to the command, and transmitting a message of successful update to the web browser.

Theimer fails to disclose or suggest displaying a homepage of the mobile telephone on the web browser, and selecting a language at the homepage displayed on the web browser, as recited in claim 3, at least for reasons similar to claim 1 (see Applicant's remarks above).

Further, the Examiner alleges that Theimer and Haudu teach all the features of claim 3 except when the data of said menu is updated in the web browser, driving, by the embedded web server of the mobile phone, the CGI/ASP program of the mobile phone to generate a command, and updating the same data updated in the mobile telephone according to the command. The Examiner relies on Henry to disclose or suggest these features. Applicant respectfully traverses this allegation.

Henry merely discloses a digital transmitter device configuration using a web browser to manually make changes to the configuration of a digital transmitter device using an embedded-web server in the digital transmitter device (see paragraph [0004]). For example, Henry discloses a browser application executing on a host computer that can be used to control the configuration information for the digital transmitter device (see paragraph 13). Henry fails to disclose or suggest that when data of a menu is updated in the web browser, driving, by the embedded web server of the mobile phone, the CGI/ASP program of the mobile phone to generate a command, and updating the same data updated in the mobile telephone according to the command, as recited in claim 3 among other features. Thus, claim 3 is allowable at least for this reason.

Claim 9 is allowable at least for these reasons as claim 3.

Claims 4-8 and 10-14 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 3 and 9, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gautam Sain/
Gautam Sain
Reg. No. 57,805

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
Main: (202) 659-9076

Date: March 22, 2010